



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,622	04/23/2007	Satoshi Washio	9683/266	5916
79510	7590	08/18/2009		
NTT DoCoMo Inc/BHGL P.O. Box 10395 Chicago, IL 60610			EXAMINER	
			SARWAR, BABAR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
08/18/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/583,622	Applicant(s) WASHIO ET AL.
	Examiner BABAR SARWAR	Art Unit 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 7-25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 7-25** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. **Claims 1-6** have been cancelled.
3. **Claims 7-25** are currently pending.

Specification

4. **Claims 13, 18** are objected to because of the following informalities:

In preamble of **claim 13**, the term “**communication terminal**” is repeated twice.

Appropriate correction is required.

In **claim 18**, the word “**to**” before “**delete**” should be abolished.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 24 is depending on **claim 27** which does not exist.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yamada et al. (US 2003/0135748 A1) in view of Philip John Hayward (GB 2369205 A), hereinafter referenced as Yamada and Philip.

Consider **claims 7, 13, and 20**, Yamada discloses a communication terminal (**Fig. 1 element 40, where Yamada discloses a portable phone**), comprising: a module interface configured to receive a module (**Para 0052, Fig. 1 elements 40, 50, where Yamada discloses SIM, UIM**), wherein the module includes a module user identification used in a communication network for identifying a user of the module (**Para 0052, Fig. 3, where Yamada discloses the UIM with a subscriber information storage area, Mobile station storage area, UIMID storage area and authentication information storage area**); a memory configured to store a content (**Abstract, Fig. 2 element 407, where Yamada discloses a storage unit**); a receiver configured to receive a message to disable a specified content (**Para 0005, 0102, Figs. 2, 14, where Yamada discloses restricting the use of contents based on certain conditions, therefore disabling the use of specified content**); a processor in communication with the module interface, the memory and the receiver (**Figs. 2, 14, where Yamada discloses a CPU in communication with the module interface, the memory and the receiver**), the processor configured to retrieve the module user identification from the module (**Abstract, Para 0144, Fig. 14, where Yamada discloses obtaining and comparing the UIMIDs, therefore retrieving the module user identification from the module**), and the processor further configured to, in response to receipt of the message, determine whether the content stored in the memory includes the specified content (**Para 0005, where Yamada discloses restricting the use of contents based on certain conditions, therefore determination that the content stored in the memory includes the specified content**), and in response to determination that

the content stored in the memory includes the specified content, the processor is further configured to determine whether the specified content is stored in the memory in correlation with the module user identification (**Para 0005, 0145, Fig. 14, where Yamada discloses cancelling the execution of the use of contents based on different UIMIDs, therefore determination whether the content stored in the memory correlates with the module user identification**); and in response to the determination that the specified content is stored in the memory in correlation with the module user identification, the processor further configured to disable use of the specified content stored in the memory (**Para 0005, 0145, Fig. 14, where Yamada discloses restricting the use of contents**).

Yamada does not explicitly disclose that aforementioned steps are implemented in response to a receipt of the message. Philip discloses that aforementioned steps are implemented in response to a receipt of the message (**Pages 3:10-12, 5:4-23, 8:1-7, 10:25-32, 11:1-5, Fig. 1A, where Philip discloses a message being sent from the database server to the personal data device to delete the contents in the storage means, therefore performing aforementioned steps in response to a receipt of the message**).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yamada with the teachings of Philip so as to ascertain the greater security of stored data as discussed on **Page 1:21-22**.

Consider **claim 8**, the combination teaches everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 7). In addition, Yamada discloses wherein to disable use of the

specified content (**Para 0005, 0102, Figs. 2, 14, where Yamada discloses restricting the use of contents based on certain conditions, therefore disabling the use of specified content**), while Philip discloses that the processor is further configured to erase the specified content from the memory (**Pages 3:10-12, where Philip discloses a message being sent from the database server to the personal data device to delete the contents in the storage means**).

Consider **claim 9**, the combination teaches everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 7). In addition, Philip discloses the processor configured to retrieve management data stored on the module, and the processor further configured to manage access to the specified content based upon the management data retrieved from the module; and the processor further configured to disable use of the specified content stored in the memory further includes the processor configured to modify the management data stored on the module to disable use of the specified content by the communication terminal (**Page 22:5-23, where Philip discloses resetting the personal data device to default setting, therefore modifying the data on the module to disable use of the specified content**).

Consider **claim 10**, the combination teaches everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 9). In addition, Yamada discloses wherein the processor is further configured to control the module based upon a type of the module (**Abstract, Para 0144, Fig. 14, where Yamada discloses obtaining and comparing the UIMIDs, therefore retrieving the module user identification from the module, therefore controlling the module based upon a type of the module**).

Consider **claim 11**, the combination teaches everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 9). In addition, Yamada discloses wherein the processor is further configured to control access to the specified content based upon a permission indication contained within the management data (**Para 0005, 0145, Fig. 14, where Yamada discloses cancelling the execution of the use of contents based on different UIMIDs, therefore controlling access to the specified content based upon a permission indication contained within the management data**).

Consider **claim 12**, the combination teaches everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 9). In addition, Philip discloses wherein in response to receipt of the message to disable the specified content, the processor is further configured to delete the specified content based upon the information contained in the management data (**Pages 3:10-12, where Philip discloses a message being sent from the database server to the personal data device to delete the contents in the storage means**).

Consider **claim 14**, the combination teaches everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 13). In addition, Philip discloses wherein the instruction to disable use of the content further comprises: an instruction to erase the content in the message to be disabled from the memory (**Page 22:5-23, where Philip discloses resetting the personal data device to default setting, therefore an instruction to erase the content in the message to be disabled from the memory**).

Claim 15, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 9.

Claim 16, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 10.

Claim 17, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 11.

Claim 18, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 12.

Consider **claim 19**, the combination teaches everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 13). In addition, Yamada discloses an instruction to, in response to the determination that the content is stored in correlation with a different user identification that other than the user identification of the module, deny access to the content (**Para 0005, 0145, Fig. 14, where Yamada discloses cancelling the execution of the use of contents based on different UIMIDs, therefore denying access to the content**).

Claim 21, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 8.

Claim 22, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 9.

Claim 23, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 10.

Claim 24, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 11.

Claim 25, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 12.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BABAR SARWAR whose telephone number is (571)270-5584. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY TO FRIDAY 09:00 A.M -05:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NICK CORSARO can be reached on (571)272-7876. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BS/

/BABAR SARWAR/

Application/Control Number: 10/583,622
Art Unit: 2617

Page 9

Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/NICK CORSARO/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617